

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/700,223		11/03/2003	Michiel van Nieuwstadt	81093007	3083	
22844	7590	07/26/2005		EXAMINER		
		ECHNOLOGIES, ANE TOWERS EA	TRAN, BINH Q			
ONE PARK				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DEARBOR)	N, MI 4	8126		3748		
				DATE MAIL ED. 07/2//2004	_	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		7 7	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/700,223	VAN NIEUWSTADT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BINH Q. TRAN	3748	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by significantly reply received by the Office later than three months after the mean adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r i. I reply within the statutory minimum of thin riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON latute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ② 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matt	·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-5,9 and 10 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) 10 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examulation The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	drawn from consideration. nd/or election requirement. niner.	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview 9	Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/700,223

Art Unit: 3748

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed May 09, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in-
- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Pfeifer et al. (Pfeifer) (Patent Number 6,725,647).

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Pfeifer discloses an exhaust gas aftertreatment system for an internal combustion engine (1) exhaust, the system comprising: an Active Lean NOx catalyst (IV); an oxidation catalyst (III) coupled downstream of said ALNC (IV); and a selective catalytic reduction catalyst (II) coupled downstream of said oxidation catalyst (III) (e.g. See Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 14-67; col. 7, lines 1-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfeifer in view of Matros et al. (Matros) (Patent Number 6,314,722).

Regarding claims 2-3, Pfeifer discloses all the claimed limitation as discussed above except a particulate filter coupled downstream of said SCR catalyst in exhaust gas aftertreatment system for a diesel engine.

Pfeifer teaches that it is conventional in the art, to use a particulate filter (38) coupled downstream of said SCR catalyst (18) in exhaust gas aftertreatment system for a diesel engine (See col. 6, lines 21-45; col. 8, lines 8-65).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use a particulate filter coupled downstream of said SCR catalyst in exhaust gas aftertreatment system for a diesel engine of Pfeifer, as taught by Matros for the purpose of absorbing the particulate in the exhaust gas, so as to reduce the poisoned materials in the purifying catalyst and to reduce amount of nitrogen oxides in the exhaust gas of the lean-burn engine, and further improve the performance of the engine and the efficiency of the emission device.

Regarding claim 4, Matros further discloses a first reductant injection system (24) adapted to inject hydrocarbon into an exhaust gas stream entering said ALNC (See col. 6, lines 21-45; col. 8, lines 8-65).

Regarding claim 5, Matros further discloses that the a second reductant injection system adapted to inject aqueous urea into an exhaust gas stream entering said 5CR catalyst (See col. 6, lines 8-67; col. 7, lines 1-58).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 10 is allowed.

Since allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant is encouraged to submit formal drawings in response to this Office action. The early submission of formal drawings will permit the Office to review the drawings for acceptability and to resolve any informalities remaining therein before the application is passed to issue. This will avoid possible delays in the issue process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 09, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not completely persuasive. *Claims 1-5, and 9-10 are pending*.

Applicant's cooperation in explaining the claims subject matter more specific to overcome the claim rejection is appreciated.

Applicants have argued that Pfeifer et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants's claimed invention. More specifically, Applicants assert that the reference to Pfeifer fails to disclose "an Active Lean NOx Catalyst (ALNC) couple upstream of the oxidation catalyst. The ALNC is a device, wherein NOx is continuously reduced in an oxygen rich environment through extra injection of reductant, such as hydrocarbon". In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

Application/Control Number: 10/700,223

Art Unit: 3748

relies (i.e., "The ALNC is a device, wherein NOx is continuously reduced in an oxygen rich environment through extra injection of reductant.") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In addition, the examiner respectfully disagrees, Collier has disclosed that "Catalyst unit IV is formed by a nitrogen oxide storage catalyst, which temporarily stores the majority of the nitrogen oxides present in lean exhaust gas and releases the previously temporarily stored nitrogen oxides in the presence of a rich, exhaust gas composition". It is well understood in the art that "nitrogen oxide storage catalyst, which temporarily stores the majority of the nitrogen oxides present in lean exhaust gas and releases the previously temporarily stored nitrogen oxides in the presence of a rich, exhaust gas composition" is also Active NOx Catalyst.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,223

Art Unit: 3748

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Examiner Binh Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4865. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Thomas E. Denion, can be reach on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone numbers for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications

and for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BT

July 22, 2005

Binh Q. Tran

Patent Examiner

Page 6

Art Unit 3748